

## REMARKS

The application has been amended to correct minor informalities so as to place the application, as a whole, into a prima facie condition for allowance. Great care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new subject matter into the application as the result of the foregoing modifications.

In the Office Action dated August 10, 2005, the Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Examiner stated Applicant must clarify the disclosure to expressly state, with reference to terms and phrases of the claim element, which structure, materials or acts perform means for actions detailed in the claim element. Although Applicant respectfully asserts that the specification fully supports the claims as submitted, Applicant has further clarified the specification to highlight the portions of the specification and drawings which support the “means for” language identified by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection and grant reconsideration to the application toward passage to allowance.

The Examiner has also objected to Claims 7 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lizarralde, et al. Applicant reserves the right to object to this reference as “prior art,” given the date of the publication, but presents the following arguments which Applicant believes obviate the necessity of any additional argument. In the Office Action, the Examiner states that Lizarralde discloses means for pivotally coupling the carriage to the frame in a manner which allows the carriage to disengage from the frame upon pivoting the carriage a predetermined angle in relation to the frame. The Examiner cites as support for this contention Figures 1-5 of Lizarralde. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection. Not only

do Figures 1-5 of Lizarralde not disclose any such disengagement of the carriage from the frame, but nothing in the drawings, specification or claims of Lizarralde teaches or suggests such a disengagement from the frame. Indeed, as noted in paragraph 0046 of the Lizarralde publication, if it is desired even to clean the firing mechanism of Lizarralde, the stock must be taken off the barrel by unscrewing bolts to allow access to the firing mechanism which is securely joined to the barrel by the pivoting axle and blocking axle. This “secure joining” teaches directly against Applicant’s claimed pivoting carriage for disengagement from the frame. Accordingly, as Lizarralde does not teach nor suggest any of Claims 1-20, and as Claim 1 is generic and allowable over the art and arguments cited by the Examiner, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner grant reconsideration to the application and grant allowance of all claims 1-20.

The Examiner is respectfully urged to call the undersigned at 515-288-9263 to discuss the claims in an effort to reach a mutual agreement with respect to claim limitations in the present application which will be effective to define the patentable subject matter of the present invention if the present claims are not deemed to be adequate for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Brett J. Trout, Reg. No. 37,250  
516 Walnut  
Des Moines, IA 50309